

REMARKS

The Applicants do not believe that examination of the foregoing amendment will result in the introduction of new matter into the present application for invention. Therefore, the Applicants, respectfully, request that the above amendment be entered in and that the claims to the present application, kindly, be reconsidered.

The Office Action dated May 5, 2005 has been received and considered by the Applicants. Claims 1-26 are pending in the present application for invention. Claims 1-26 are rejected by the May 5, 2005 Office Action.

Claim 21 is objected to because of the following informalities: line 2 "that" should be inserted between "such" and "each". The foregoing amendment has corrected this oversight.

The Office Action rejects Claims 1, 6-8, 10, and 24-26 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 102(c) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,530,083 issued in the name of Liebenow (hereinafter referred to as Liebenow).

Regarding Claim 1, the Examiner states that Liebenow discloses the subject matter defined by the rejected claims. The Applicants, respectfully, disagree. The rejected claims define subject matter for automatically detecting a user detection system that automatically detects which users are currently within a predetermined viewing area. The Examiner alleges that this subject matter is disclosed by Liebenow in Fig. 1, Fig. 4, Col. 4 lines 4-67, Col. 5 lines 1-47, Col. 7 lines 51-67, and Col. 8 lines 1-29. The Examiner alleges that Liebenow teaches that the processor automatically detects users after receiving inputs from I/O devices. The Applicants, respectfully point out that this is a there is no automatic detection of which users are currently within a predetermined viewing area. Liebenow clearly teaches that the user may be prompted to provide their identity, select their identity from a displayed list, enter their identity using an input/output device or provide their identity by depressing one of a number of user switches (see col. 4, lines 56-67). The fact that user input is required to identify the user is again affirmed on col. 6, lines 1-12 and col. 7, lines 60-67. There is no disclosure, or suggestion, within Liebenow for automatic detection of which users are currently within a predetermined viewing area. The Applicants, respectfully, submit that even a broad

reading of the terms recited by the rejected claims does not allow for "automatic" to be viewed as synonymous or equivalent to the manual user input that is required by the teachings of Liebenow. However, in an effort to move this case towards allowance, the claims have been amended to define subject matter for "the user detection system comprises at least one of a computer vision system, a voice recognition system, a fingerprint recognition system, or a handprint recognition system." This subject matter is not disclosed or suggested by the cited prior art references.

The Office Action rejects Claim 2 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Liebenow in view of US Patent No. 5,721,583 issued in the name of Harada et al. (hereinafter referred to as Harada et al.). The Examiner asserts that Harada et al. teach voice recognition and fingerprint recognition. The rejection thus seeks to combine the teachings of Harada et al. with Liebenow to arrive at the claimed subject matter. Harada et al. teach recognition of individual users. There is no disclosure or suggestion within Harada et al. for the automatic detection of which users are currently within a predetermined viewing area. The Applicants, respectfully, point out that there must be some suggestion or motivation to combine the references. The Office Action has not supplied any suggestion or motivation to combine Harada et al. with Liebenow to arrive at the claimed subject matter. Therefore, this rejection does not make a prima facie case of obviousness.

The Examiner take Official Notice that it is well known to use hand print recognition systems as biometric recognition systems. The Applicants, respectfully, submit that it is not obvious or well known to automatically detect which users are currently within a predetermined viewing area using hand print recognition systems. Therefore, the Applicants request that the Examiner provide prior art references that illustrate that it is well known to automatically detect which users are currently within a predetermined viewing area using hand print recognition systems. In view of the foregoing, this rejection is traversed.

The Office Action rejects Claim 3 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Liebenow in view of Harada et al. and further in view of US Patent No. 5,164,992 issued in the name of Turk (hereinafter referred to as Turk). This rejection is traversed for the reason states in the response to the rejection of Claim 2.

Serial No. 09/882,158

10

The Office Action rejects Claims 4-5, 9, 11-21 and 23 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Liebenow in view of US Patent No. 6,813,775 issued in the name of Finseth (hereinafter referred to as Finseth). The Applicants, respectfully submit that this rejection is moot in view of the foregoing amendment to the claims or alternately regarding Claims 4-5 this rejection is traversed for the reasons stated in the response to the rejection of Claim 1.

The Office Action rejects Claim 22 under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Liebcnow in view of Finseth and further in view of US Patent No. 6,614,987 issued in the name of Ismail (hereinafter referred to as Ismail). The Applicants, respectfully submit that this rejection is moot in view of the foregoing amendment to the claims .

The Applicant is not aware of any additional patents, publications, or other information not previously submitted to the Patent and Trademark Office which would be required under 37 C.F.R. 1.99.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance, with such allowance being, respectfully, requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

James D. Leimbach
Patent Attorney Reg. No. 34,374

Please address all correspondence for this application to:
Michael E. Belk, Senior Intellectual Property Counsel
Philips Intellectual Property & Standards
Philips Electronics N.A. Corp.
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001 USA
Tel No. (914) 333-9643

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION
I hereby certify that this correspondence
is being transmitted on this date via
facsimile transmission to (571) 273-8300 AND addressed to:
Mail Stop: Amendment
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Date of Transmission: September 5, 2005

(Signature) 

By:

James D. Leimbach

Serial No. 09/882,158

12